

A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOCT. BIBLE.

"The One Sacrifice for sin," is the title which Mr. Jenkins gives to his fourth lecture, the object of which is to show that, the Mass is not a Sacrifice, and that, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the body of Our Lord is not really, and truly, present. The two subjects are indeed so intimately connected that they cannot be treated separately. To assert that "the Mass a Sacrifice," is to assert the Real Presence—or Transubstantiation; and to deny the Sacrifice, is to deny the Real Presence. Mr. Jenkins has therefore, done well in treating of both these doctrines of the Catholic Church under the same head.

In all controversies, and especially in theological controversies, it is well for the disputants to have a certain knowledge of what they are disputing about: and to attain this, it is essentially requisite to have a clear understanding of the meaning of the terms employed; we will therefore commence our reply to Mr. Jenkins' objections, by defining Sacrifice; and we cannot do better than use the terms employed by Bellarmin in his treatise on the Mass—b. 1, c. 2.

"A Sacrifice is the oblation to God alone, by the legitimate minister, of some sensible thing; by the change, or destruction of which—man acknowledges the sovereign majesty of God—and, confessing his weakness, seeks to deprecate the Divine wrath, and to obtain mercy, and forgiveness of sin."

A Sacrifice may be either bloody, or unbloody; of both we have examples in the Jewish law; but it is or the latter only that we would speak, in treating of the Mass.

Now, the Catholic doctrine is this—That, in the Mass—of sensible objects—bread and wine—an oblation is made to God; that these sensible objects, do, by the power of Almighty God, undergo a change—and that the Mass is therefore a true and proper Sacrifice; through which, if with a right faith, and in a truly penitent spirit, we approach God, we obtain mercy, and find grace to help us in time of need.

"Doet sancta Synodus sacrificium istud vere propitiarium esse, per ipsumque fieri ut, si cum vero corde et recta fide, cum metu et reverentia, contriti penitentes ad Deum accedamus, misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno."—*Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii. c. 2.*

Against this doctrine of the Catholic Church, Mr. Jenkins protests, urging the ordinary Protestant objections:

1. That it detracts from the merits of Christ's Sacrifice, offered for us, once, upon the cross.
 2. That it is repugnant to the words of Scripture—that is—as he—Mr. Jenkins—understands them.
 3. That it implies the truth of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which, of course, must be false.
- The Catholic replies—1st—That the doctrine of the Church respecting the Mass, does not detract from the merits or value of the great Sacrifice offered for all—once—upon the cross. 2nd—That it is not repugnant to the words of Scripture, properly understood. And 3rd—that, though the assertion of a true and proper Sacrifice in the Mass, does most assuredly imply a real change of substance in the things offered—or Transubstantiation—that doctrine must be shown to be false, ere the validity of any argument against the Mass, based upon its falsity, can be admitted. We will first consider the first two objections—the third, involving the protest against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or the Real Presence, we will notice separately.

The texts of Scripture upon which Mr. Jenkins relies, as containing the condemnation of the Catholic doctrine, are taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews—ninth and tenth chapters: in which we read that—"Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many;" that—"once at the end of ages, He hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of Himself;" and—"Nor yet that He should offer Himself often." If to these we add—the texts from the tenth chapter of the same Epistle—"By the which will we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once;" "For by one oblation He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," and that—from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans—"For in that He died to sin, He died once"—we shall have the sum of the scriptural arguments which our author adduces in support of his protest against the Catholic doctrine; it is to these that we propose to reply. All that can be required of us is, to show that these texts are susceptible of an interpretation compatible with the teaching of the Church, respecting the nature, and efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Mass. We do not intend, to attempt even, to establish the truth of that teaching from Scripture; but merely to show that, from the texts cited, nothing can be certainly concluded against it.

First, we contend that, from the above cited texts, it cannot be concluded that the Catholic doctrine detracts from the value, or the efficacy, of the Sacrifice offered, for all, and once, upon the Cross. That Sacrifice was indeed of infinite value, for the remission of the sins of the whole world; in it the price of man's redemption, or ransom for sin, was fully paid; but it does not thence follow, that, because offered fully for all, its merits are at once applied to all, without any act on their part. "Two things are necessary for the remission of sins"—says Bellarmin, in his answer to the same objection from the Protestants of his day, as that which we are now noticing:—

"Unum, ut inveniantur primum liberationis, seu satisfactio iusta et debita divine iustitie. Alterum, ut primum in partem applicetur hominibus."—*De Missa, l. 1, c. 25.*

As regards the first, the Sacrifices of the Cross remits all sins, past, present, and to come; and therefore, having been once offered, there can be need of any similar oblation—i.e., *pro acquirendo primum ad remissionem peccatorum*. In this sense, therefore, the Apostle says, and the Church teaches, that the Sacrifice of Christ can never be repeated. But, as regards the second, the sins of every particular individual have not as yet been remitted; it is requisite, therefore, that the price, paid by Christ,—that the merits of the One Sacrifice—should be applied to

every individual sinner; and therefore, in this sense, there is need of a continual Sacrifice for sin; which need is met by the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.

In fact, the Catholic doctrine is this—That, by the Sacrifice of the Mass, the merits of the ONE Sacrifice of the Cross, paid for all, in general, are applied to each one of us, for the remission of our sins, in particular. Not indeed precisely in the same manner as in the Sacrament of Baptism, or Penance, or "immediate"—in the words of St. Thomas—"non sicut causa proxima, sed in quantum gratiam contritionis eis impetrat." But, if the Sacrament of Baptism, by which is applied in particular, the price of the redemption paid for all by Christ upon the Cross, detract not from the merits of that ONE Sacrifice; then neither can the application of the same price, though in a different manner, and by a different action—as in the Sacrifice of the Mass—detract from the merits of that ONE Sacrifice.

Secondly, we deny that the passages cited from the Epistles of St. Paul, are necessarily repugnant to the teaching of the Catholic Church respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Apostle is insisting upon the superiority—of the New, over the Old dispensation—of the Christian sacrifice, and Christian priesthood, over the Mosaic sacrifices, and priesthood. In proof of that superiority, he adduces the constant repetitions of the latter—thus showing their insufficiency, from the necessity of their constant repetition. But Christ has, by His ONE oblation, offered a sacrifice of infinite value, by which He has paid the ransom of all our sins; it remains only that that ransom, paid in general, should be applied to each, in particular; and for this purpose, it is not necessary that Christ should again die—should again suffer—or should again offer the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. It required indeed a bloody sacrifice to pay that ransom—for "without shedding of blood there is no remission;" but to apply the ransom already paid, an unbloody sacrifice is sufficient. With that unbloody sacrifice we are furnished in the Mass, in which the same body that was broken for us on the Cross, is, by us, but in an unbloody manner, presented. All then that can be gathered from the words of the Apostle, is—that Christ should never again die—never again suffer—never again be sacrificed in a bloody manner—after the manner of the sacrifices of the Old Law. In this sense, we can admit the full force of the texts which Mr. Jenkins quotes; and can, nevertheless, recognise in the Mass a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice; the oblation of the Lamb who was slain from the beginning of the world.

Although all that can be required of us is to show—that, betwixt the teaching of St. Paul, and the doctrines of the Catholic Church, there is no irreconcilable discrepancy—none greater in fact than there is between Mr. Jenkins' doctrine of the co-equality of Father and Son—and our Lord's express assertion of the superiority of the Father—we will undertake to show that the present doctrine of the Church—that, the Mass is a true and proper, though unbloody, Sacrifice—obtained prior to the end of the VI. century, an epoch, prior to which, according to Mr. Jenkins—it may be said that the corruptions of the Church of Rome had not commenced. We purposely abstain from employing the arguments from Scripture in favor of the Catholic doctrine, because, as we have said before, a Catholic should never chop Scripture with heretics, but content himself, with simply asserting the authority of the Church, as the only authority, in all matters of religion, given by God to man. Our thesis is, that in the first ages of Christianity, the belief in the Sacrifice of the Mass obtained, and that, therefore, Protestantism which rejects it, is not the "OLD RELIGION."

In support of our proposition, we have but to turn to the oldest liturgies extant; nothing can be clearer, nothing more explicit than their language; nothing, to the unprejudiced mind, more convincing than the universal consent, upon this one point, of so many schismatic sects, differing from one another, as well as from the Catholic Church, upon so many others.—In the East, and in the West, amongst the Greek schismatics, and the Monophysites of Syria, and Egypt, there always was but one doctrine respecting the Mass—that it was, indeed, a true, and proper Sacrifice.

In the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, certainly in use in the IV century, we have the following:—

"Receive, O God, our prayers; make us worthy to offer unto Thee prayers, and supplications, and unbloody Sacrifices—*christian anamaktous*—in behalf of all Thy people."

In the liturgy of St. Basil, the prayer of the Offertory contains the following supplication:—

"Receive us, O Lord, approaching to Thy holy altar, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, that we become worthy to offer unto Thee, this reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifice—*anamaktous*—in behalf of our own sins, and the errors of Thy people. Receive this Sacrifice upon Thy holy, and reasonable altar."

In the liturgy of St. Mark, we find the same doctrine of the "unbloody Sacrifice":—

"We offer up this reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifice—*anamaktous*—latterly—which all the nations offer up to Thee O Lord, from the rising of the sun, unto the going down thereof, from the North, and from the South; for Thy name is great among all the nations; and in every place, incense and sacrifice, and oblation, are put up to Thy Holy Name."

Here we have the unbloody Sacrifice of the New Law clearly identified with that spoken of by the prophet Malachias, under the name of "Minchah"—and which is defined by Gesenius as—"a gift offered to a divinity, a sacrifice, especially a sacrifice without blood, as opposed to *zebach*,—a bloody sacrifice."

Amongst the Jacobites, or Syrian Monophysites, the liturgy of St. James is in use; in this liturgy we still find the doctrine of the Mass,—an unbloody Sacrifice—distinctly recognised:—

"Offerimus tibi hoc sacrificium terribile et incruentum, ut non secundum peccata nostra agas nobiscum."

So explicit indeed is the testimony given by all the ancient liturgies to the Catholic doctrine, that Calvin, to evade its force, found himself compelled to

tax their authors with error, and with having corrupted the doctrine of Christ with Judaical practices.—*Inst. l. iv., c. 18.* But this is at variance with Mr. Jenkins' admission, that the corruptions of the Church of Rome may be said to have commenced about the end of the VI century; for even Protestants admit that the liturgies, from which we have quoted, were in use prior to that fatal epoch.

Another proof of the antiquity of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Mass may be found in the writings of the Fathers. We shall content ourselves with citing two only. St. Chrysostom in the East, and St. Augustin in the West.

Commenting upon Hebrews—10. c.—St. Chrysostom says:—

"What then, do we not offer—or make an oblation—every day? We offer up indeed, but with a remembrance of his death; and this oblation is one, not many. How is it one, and not many? he asks. 'Because, as he that is offered many times, and in many places, is the same body, not many and different bodies, so is it one sacrifice. He' (Christ) 'is our high priest, who offered this sacrifice, by which we are cleansed: we now offer up the same.'"

Our second quotation is taken from St. Augustin, *Civ. Dei, l. 22, c. viii.*—and is the more valuable, because the writer is not directly treating, either of the Mass—or the Real Presence. Hesperius, a wealthy citizen, applied to one of St. Augustin's priests for deliverance from a demoniacal possession with which his servants had long been afflicted. The Bishop himself was absent; but one of his presbyters proceeded to the spot, and, in the words of St. Augustin, "offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ, praying fervently, that the affliction might cease."

"Perrexit unus"—presbyter—"obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi, orans quantum potuit, ut cessaret illa vexatio: Deo propitius miserante cessavit."

Again, in the same book, St. Augustin thus insists upon the difference of the miracles obtained by the intercession of the martyrs, and those attributed to the pagan deities. After showing that the Christians did not build temples to their martyrs, as did the heathens to their false Gods, he adds:—

"Nec ibi erigimus altaria, in quibus sacrificemus martyribus, sed ubi Deo, et martyrum, et nostro; ad quod sacrificium, sicut homines Dei, qui mundum in eius confessione vicerunt, suo loco et ordine nominantur; non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, invocantur. Deo quippe, non ipsis sacrificat, quamvis in Memoria sacrificet eorum: quia Dei sacerdos est, non illorum. Ipsum vero sacrificium corpus est Christi."—*l. 22, c. x.*

Here we have the fact of a sacrifice in the Christian Church—and of what that sacrifice consists—"Corpus Christi"—plainly set forth. The efficacy too, of that sacrifice, as in the case of the tormented Hesperius—is insisted upon in a manner which shows that St. Augustin was—in the matter of the Mass—a bigoted and most superstitious Papist.

Our last argument in proof of the antiquity of sacrificial worship in the Church, is deduced from the fact that, in the earliest ages of Christianity, the Christians used altars; though during the periods of persecution these altars were not permanent. The terms sacrifice and altar, are co-relative; where we can assert the one, we can surely predicate the other; and always from the nature of the altar—or the nature of the sacrifice offered thereon—or the nature of the altar on which sacrifice was offered. Sensible and material sacrifices require sensible and material altars, as sensible and material altars always imply a sensible and material sacrifice. Now, it is certain from history, from ecclesiastical monuments still remaining, that the Christians of the IV. century had sensible and material altars; it is therefore certain that they had a sensible, and material sacrifice to offer thereon. Figurative altars, such as those described by Mr. Jenkins, (p. 171), may do well enough for merely figurative sacrifices.

"We have an altar"—says Mr. Jenkins—"whose foundations are the glorious attributes of God cemented together by divine love." And this altar, "cemented by love," and "founded on attributes," Mr. Jenkins finds, sometimes on a "craggy rock," sometimes "on the top of an ocean wave"—a very unlikely place, it must be confessed—and sometimes "in the groves of a mantled forest." All this is no doubt highly poetical, and perfectly unintelligible—a profane person might deem it balderdash—but it is very unlike the description given of the altars used by the Christians of the IV century. St. Gregory of Nyssa, in fact, appears quite prosaic, and commonplace alongside of Mr. Jenkins. He has one advantage however, which the modern has not—he speaks intelligibly, and his meaning is easily understood.—Here is St. Gregory's description of an old-fashioned Christian Altar, of the IV century.

"This holy altar is but of common stone, in no wise differing from other stones wherewith we build the walls of our houses. But since it has been dedicated to God, and received the benediction, we esteem it a holy and immaculate altar, which must no longer be approached by all, but to which the priests alone have access.—St. Gregori Nyssen. Or. De Sancto Christi Baptismo."

Mr. Jenkins' altar is exempt from one inconvenience, to which, it seems, the altars of the OLD RELIGION were occasionally exposed, when heretics got possession of their churches. The latter were liable to be broken, which the former from the very exposed situations in which it is sometimes found—in a mantled forest—on the top of a crag, or occasionally of an "ocean wave"—we should trust is not. St. Optatus, of Milevanus, often complains of the violence of the Donatists in this respect—a violence, of which the Protestants of the XVI century were apt imitators; thus showing by their conduct, how incompatible were the old Catholic altar, with the new-fangled worship which the disciples of Luther, Calvin, and Zuinglius sought to foist upon the world, as the OLD RELIGION. From the simple fact then, that the early Christians had real, substantial, and material altars, we may safely conclude that they had also, a true, and proper, Sacrifice to offer thereon; something more substantial than Mr. Jenkins' airy nothings which he offers up on an altar which he finds on the top of an "ocean wave."

MEETING OF IRISH CATHOLICS.

We have been requested to insert the following Resolutions, agreed to at a meeting of the Irish Catholics of Frampton, and the adjacent Townships—held on the 1st inst., in the vicinity of St. Edward's Church, for the purpose of taking into consideration the present state of affairs in Quebec, consequent upon the disturbances growing out of the visit to that city, of the mountebank Gavazzi:—

James Butler, Esq., J. P., was unanimously called to the chair, and Mr. John Duff was requested to act as secretary.

"Resolved"—On motion of Captain Nelliger, seconded by Mr. William Semple:—

"That, whilst we condemn any attack on the religious assemblies of our Protestant fellow-citizens, we cannot forget, that the loudest brawling against those who were unpremeditatedly engaged in the trifling affair at Chalmers's Church, was raised by the descendants of the infamous Knox, whose Calvinistic fury was vented against everything, sacred in religion, and beautiful in art; and who hounded on his unhappy dupes, to the destruction of the beautiful Abbeys, and splendid Churches, of once Catholic and moral Scotland."

On motion of Mr. Christopher Nugent, seconded by Mr. Thomas Fitzgerald:—

"That we have noticed with the deepest indignation and disgust, the course pursued by the mis-called organs of public opinion, published in the English language in Quebec; and which, instead of softening down the asperities, which have lately sprung up in that formerly peaceable city, have exerted all their malice to increase and perpetuate them."

On motion of Mr. James Coyle, seconded by Mr. Michael Brennan:—

"That, in consequence, we are determined to support, to the utmost of our ability, any liberal Journal which shall be established in Quebec, for the purpose of rebutting the slanders, that continually emanate from a bigoted and hostile press, against the home of our hearts, and the religion of our deepest convictions."

On motion of Mr. John Codd, seconded by Mr. Patrick Moran:—

"That the conduct of the Sheriff of Quebec, in deliberately falsifying the Jury Panels, was so outrageously corrupt, that we can place no reliance in any government, which still continues to retain in office, a man who has notoriously abused the all-important trust confided to his charge."

On motion of Mr. James Murphy, seconded by Mr. John Marigom:—

"That we perceive, that the concentrated malice, and virulent bigotry, of the rabid Protestantism of Quebec, are directed against the efficient and conscientious Inspector of Police, in that city, merely because he is an Irishman, and a Catholic; that his continuance in office will be regarded by us, as some proof, that the government have respect for the feelings of a people, who have manfully stood by them on former occasions; and that, were he a snivelling and spouting sectarian, and an anti-ministerialist, instead of an impartial and upright gentleman, his conduct would never have been called in question by his present unscrupulous assailants."

The Chairman having vacated the chair, Mr. William Millar was moved thereto, and the thanks of the numerous assemblage were voted to the former Chairman for his efficient conduct in the chair.

Our correspondent, to whom we are indebted for the above report, adds:—

"Such, Sir, are the resolutions adopted by this meeting. They are warmly worded, but each word leaps directly from the heart. When we see the namby-pambyism of the *Mercury*, the blue bigotry of the *Gazette*, and the continual verbal diarrhoea of the *Chronicle*, all coalesced to pander to the vile passions of a bitter, but ignorant faction, we have thought it high time to come forward and give expression to our feelings."

We are happy to see by the San Francisco papers that John Mitchell, and family, had arrived safely, on the 12th ult., from Tahiti.

COLONEL PRINCE.—A correspondent of the *Toronto Colonist*, writing from Sandwich, says:—"An unpleasant affair took place at the Sandwich Assizes, on Tuesday last, between Colonel Prince and Charles Baby, Esq. They were not on good terms for some time previous, in consequence of an Indian Land dispute. Colonel Prince in an address to the jury, spoke of Mr. Baby in very harsh language, saying he was a great scoundrel. This was in Baby's presence, in the Court, where the Counsel sat, and before the Chief Justice he being on the Bench. A short time afterwards, the Colonel had occasion to move, and came close to Mr. Baby, who told him that, if he repeated the obnoxious expression, it would be the last time he would do so. The Colonel said,—"I do repeat it, before these witnesses," pointing to the persons standing by. Mr. Baby immediately struck Colonel Prince with the back of his hand on the face, and the crack was heard all over the Court. Colonel Prince directly appealed to the Court. The Chief Justice took the affair in hands, and sentenced Mr. Baby to one month's imprisonment in the common gaol, and a fine of ten pounds. So the matter rests."

Died.

At Quebec, on the 8th inst., F. X. Methot, Esq., aged 56 years.

CATHOLIC INSTITUTE.

NOTICE.

A MEETING of the MEMBERS of the CATHOLIC INSTITUTE, and of all disposed to become Members, will take place on MONDAY EVENING next, the 14th inst., in St. PATRICK'S HALL, Place d'Armes.

By Order of the Committee,
R. P. REDMOND,
Secretary.

November 9, 1853.